

We are not quite sure what the Examiner's objection is under Sec. 112. But, we think the following may clarify any misunderstandings. The terms "known" and "unknown" as applied to the "biopolymer segments" refers to such segments being identified "known" or not identified. For example, if a DNA is identified as being XYZ DNA, but, ABC (unknown) DNA is not identified. We can have an identified (known) DNA caused to "gather" at the site and the other not-identified (unknown) DNA caused to be hybridized therewith is the same. As to whether the "segments" are mobile or immobile. Normally, in the container, all of the "segments" are mobile. With application of electric fields, the known segments are caused to be immobile, that is gathered at the sites of the "protrusions" or spots in the electrodes, and then the mobile "unknown" segments are caused to migrate and being "gathered" and thus cause "hybridization". The term "mobile" and "immobile" may not be the most appropriate; thus they are not used often. However, we have inserted the term "normally mobile" to show that the various segments are loose within the container. The term "gathered" is used to show that when the electric field is turned on the segments will be migrated to the sites.

We hope the above will answer the questions. If more information is needed, please telephone below attorney.

SECTION 102 REJECTION OVERCOME.

Claims 30-47 have been allowed. Hence, no comments is needed regarding these claims.

Claim 48 was rejected under Sec.102 over Chong and Wen-Tung. Applicant has amended claim 48 (and added sub-claim 49) to more

clearly define the invention, and to avoid the Sec. 102 rejections.

We now further recite that the "container" is "hermetically sealed". and that such "container" is "removable replaceably". Clearly, neither references discloses this concept of using readily replaceable different containers to identify and/or measure "biopolymer segments".

The concept of using replaceable "cartridges" in the DNA identification procedure is clearly new and not done by Chong ro Wen-Tung.

Furthermore, we have means for "causing said known biopolymer to be immobilized at particular sites within said container". and then "cause said mobile unknown biopolymer segments to approach said immobilized known biopolymer segments so as to increase speed of hybridization". Clearly, this is not disclosed, shown or made obvious by either Chong or Weng-Tung.

Finally, as to claim 49, neither Chong nor Tung uses a "means for optically viewing the hybridized segments".

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully solicits continued allowance of claims 30-47 and allowance of claims 48,49.

Respectfully

M. KOJIMA

MOONRAY KOJIMA
BOX 627
WILLIAMSTOWN, MA 01267
Tel (413)458-2880
28 feb 04